



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

MONDAY, APRIL 28TH, 1856.

JAMES HENTHORN TODD, D. D., PRESIDENT,
in the Chair.

MR. E. CLIBBORN, by permission of the Academy, read a paper on the identity of the chronological system of the priests of Memphis, as explained to Herodotus, and the succession of the kings of Egypt, attributed to Manetho.

The object of the author was, in the first place, to show that a critique on Herodotus in the "Royal Irish Academy Transactions," vol. xxii. Pol. Lit. p. 49, was not applicable either to the chronology of the reign of Sabacon, or Anysis, which appears to precede it, and of Sethos, who was a contemporary of Sabacon; and, in the second place, to prove that the royal chronology of the Egyptian priests at Memphis and Heliopolis, and especially at the latter place, as it was explained by a reference to a series of images there of 345 statues of Pironeses, was, in theory, identical with Manetho's system of chronology to the end of the twenty-sixth dynasty, or the beginning of the Persian dynasty, in whose time both Hecatæus and Herodotus visited Egypt.

It was explained, that according to the corrected lists of Manetho's dynasties, the actual number of reigns of all the kings of Egyptian and of foreign origin, including Sabacon and two other Ethiopian kings, and one queen's reign, in Egypt, was 346 *only* to the Persian Conquest; and thus, the total numbers of reigns of kings, of Pironeses at Heliopolis, and of priests at Memphis, as explained to Herodotus, were the same up to the Persian dominion, as the number of reigns stated by Manetho.

It was also explained, that Bunsen, in the exposition in his "Egypt's Place," &c., vol. i. p. 105, of what he erroneously calls Herodotus's view of the chronology of Egypt, had fallen

into a great mistake in supposing that the *stone* statue of Sethos (Smintheos) in the Temple of Vulcan, at Memphis, was to be counted with the 341 (or 345 ?) *wooden* images in the storehouse there, and that the count of the number of reigns of kings, of priests, and of generations of men in Egypt from Menes, was to be carried down *only to the time of Sethos*, the contemporary of Sennacherib, and not to Amasis of the twenty-sixth dynasty.

A statement preserved by Herodotus, but overlooked by Bunsen and all other modern writers, as to the interval of time between the construction of the mound of Anysis, and its discovery by Amyrtæus, was adduced to prove that an interval of at least 300 years existed between the reign of the king called Anysis, and Sethos, or Sabacon; so that the events of the reign of Anysis are not to be considered as immediately preceding the reign of Sabacon, as is generally supposed by modern writers, who have overlooked the fact of an interval of 700 years between Anysis and Amyrtæus. Thus, it was proved that Herodotus's statements concerning Anysis do not immediately precede Sabacon, who is mistaken in his present text for another king of Cuthean, but not of African origin, whose name or title was Saba, identical with that of the enemy of "the son of Anosh," of the Arabs, who may be identified with Anysis of Herodotus.

It was shown that the two Ethiopian kings—who, with or after Sabacon, ruled in Egypt,—the shepherds or Hycsos, and the Shethites, or blue-eyed kings of the monuments,—belong to the group of seventeen kings, called altogether, with Sabacon, by the Egyptian priests, eighteen Ethiopians, in the text of Herodotus—to a great extent, fill up the gap of 300 years between Anysis and Sabacon; whose reign, probably in his own country, may have subtended the reigns of his son and grandson, Sabacus and Tirhaka, in Egypt: and thus, the author maintained, we might reconcile the statements in Herodotus with matters of fact which followed Sabacon's actual rule in Egypt.

The appointment of Sethos, probably in the place of Bocchonis, to the chief rule in Lower Egypt, at Sais, was considered to have been an act of the Ethiopic king or kings of the day.

It was denied that Sethos could have been a priest of Vulcan at all ; and that, where he is so called in the present text of Herodotus, the words are redundant, and altogether contradict facts stated elsewhere in Herodotus ; and hence we are obliged to reject the title of priest " of Vulcan," and call Sethos simply a priest or a prophet of a "*god*," or "*gods*," whose proper name, if known, would not have been mentioned by Pagan priests, who, by calling the prophet, Sethos, attributed his gifts to Typhon, or Seth, the evil genius of the neighbourhood of Pelusion, according to Egyptian superstition.

The analogy in the description, by Herodotus, of the vision of Sethos with one of the two visions of the prophet Isaiah, led the author to identify the party called Sethos by the priests of Vulcan, at Memphis, by the diabolical title Sethos, with the Jewish prophet Isaiah, or E-Sais ; and adopt Herodotus's statements as explanatory of the means adopted by Providence for the fulfilment of the prophecy, that the Assyrians should not shoot an arrow or raise a shield at Jerusalem. It was also shown, that the statements in Herodotus, taken in connexion with the Biblical notices of Sennacherib's defeat, and a quotation from Berosus preserved by Josephus, that the mode of the first discomfiture of Sennacherib at Pelusion was exactly the same in kind with that of the Midianites and their allies,—the different nations, Arabs, Assyrians, Medes, and Persians, composing Sennacherib's army, having quarrelled and fought with each other with their swords, and without shields. To this battle Herodotus refers, when he notices the bones of the people he saw at Pelusion who fell on the occasion of the discovery of the depredations committed by the mice on their bow-strings and shield-handles, during the night after the arrival of the army before Pelusion.

These explanations were offered to save Herodotus's reputation from the critique quoted from the Transactions, so far as it related to the real period of Sabacon, and of the reign which appears to precede it, and that which was, at least in part, contemporary with it and after it; and to prove the general accuracy of Herodotus as a reporter of statements made to him by the Egyptian pagan priests, and others; and as suggestive of the omission of a few words in his text, which appear to have been introduced into it by some Arab critic who understood Greek, but who had no knowledge of chronology, or of Manetho's dynasties; and the identity in duration of the chronology of the priests at Heliopolis and Memphis, with that of the priest of Sebennytis in the time of Ptolemy II.

In conclusion, it was shown, that the particular facts, said, in the critique referred to, to be undeserving of the slightest credit, were on the contrary, worthy of the special notice of Biblical scholars, as being supplementary to facts recorded in the Scriptures, which in themselves are insufficient to realize the historical identities of the "son of Anosh," as a king, both before and after his retreat to the Ausitis. The few words in Herodotus relating to this prince just supply the *desiderata* which give him an historical reality in time and place, and indicate his position in the monuments as the foster-brother of Horus, or the Hawk, of the eighteenth dynasty of Manetho, and not as the immediate predecessor of Sethos.

The notices of Sethos, in the text of Herodotus, are invaluable, as they supply everything that is necessary to explain the facts of Sennacherib's discomfiture, and how it was that the prophecies relating to that event were all of them completely fulfilled, "here" at Pelusion, where Isaiah or Sethos was, and "there" at Jerusalem, where Hezekiah was when he sent the embassy to Isaiah. By the identification of Sethos and Isaiah, the notices of this prince in Herodotus at once open the way to the grouping together of a number of other fragments

of the personal history of Isaiah, to be found elsewhere; and as these are numerous, extending backwards to his infancy, and are quite consistent with other facts and references in the writings of Isaiah, we thus become indirectly indebted to Herodotus for a biography of the chief of the prophets, about whose personal history so little has been preserved by the Jewish writers, though he really appears to have been one of the most extraordinary characters who ever appeared in Eastern history.

Dr. John B. Barker read a paper on the stomach of the zebu.

The Secretary of the Academy announced a donation of two copies of a large medal in copper and silver, struck by the order of George V., King of Hanover, in honour of Carl F. Gauss, and presented to the Academy by order of His Majesty, through the Royal Society of Göttingen.